

## REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5-14, 17, and 18 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 5, 9, 11, 13, 17, and 18 being independent. Claims 5-8, 13, 14, and 18 stand withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-3, 9-12, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,378,070 (Chan) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,320 (Ishiguro), and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0131593 (Parry). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Independent Claim 1 relates to an information processing apparatus comprising a code reception unit, a random number generation unit, a code conversion unit, a random number encryption unit, a print data encryption unit, and a transmission unit. The code reception unit is adapted to receive a personal identification code, the personal identification code being input by a user of the information processing apparatus via an operation unit. The random number generation unit is adapted to generate a random number. The code conversion unit is adapted to convert the received personal identification code by using a predetermined function. The random number encryption unit is adapted to encrypt the random number generated by the random number generation unit, by using the personal identification code or the converted personal identification code as an encryption key. The print data encryption unit is adapted to encrypt print data by using the random number as an encryption key. The transmission unit is adapted to transmit the encrypted random number, the converted personal identification code and the encrypted print data to a print control apparatus which is connected to the information processing apparatus via a network.

Thus, a random number is encrypted using a user-inputted personal identification code inputted into the apparatus, print data is encrypted using the random number as an encryption key, and the encrypted random number, the personal identification code, which has been converted using a predetermined function, and the encrypted print data is transmitted to a print control apparatus. By this arrangement, only the user who inputted the personal identification

code by the information processing apparatus (or someone the user informed of the personal identification code), can decode the encrypted print data.

In contrast, the citations to Chan, Ishiguro, and Parry are not understood to disclose or suggest that a) a random number is encrypted using a user-inputted personal identification code inputted into the apparatus, b) print data is encrypted using the random number as an encryption key, or c) the encrypted random number, the personal identification code, which has been converted using a predetermined function, and the encrypted print data are transmitted to a print control apparatus, as recited by Claim 1. More specifically, these citations are not understood to disclose or suggest a random number encryption unit adapted to encrypt the random number generated by a random number generation unit, by using a personal identification code input by a user of the information processing apparatus via an operation unit and received by a code reception unit of the apparatus or the personal identification code, converted by a code conversion unit adapted to convert the received personal identification code by using a predetermined function, as an encryption key, as recited by Claim 1. In addition, these citations are not understood to disclose or suggest a print data encryption unit adapted to encrypt print data by using the random number as an encryption key, or a transmission unit adapted to transmit the encrypted random number, the converted personal identification code and the encrypted print data to a print control apparatus which is connected to the information processing apparatus via a network, as also recited by Claim 1.

Rather, the Parry publication is understood to disclose a system which transmits a print job to a preselected recipient. More specifically, in Parry, if a user selects a secure print option, this user is understood to be identified and the user may input a PIN (personal identification number) for identification purposes. But this PIN is not understood to be used as a key for encryption in Parry. Thus, Parry is not understood to encrypt a random number using a user-inputted personal identification code inputted into the apparatus, as recited by Claim 1. Nor are Chan or Ishiguro understood to teach or suggest this concept. Paragraph 11 of the Office Action indicates that Ishiguro discloses the claimed random number encryption unit. But Ishiguro is understood to merely disclose that a generated random number may be used as an encryption

key. Ishiguro is not understood to disclose that the random number itself is encrypted. Moreover, Ishiguro is not understood to disclose or suggest a random number encryption unit adapted to encrypt the random number generated by the random number generation unit, by using a personal identification code input by a user of the information processing apparatus via an operation unit and received by a code reception unit of the apparatus or the personal identification code, converted by a code conversion unit adapted to convert the received personal identification code by using a predetermined function, as an encryption key, as recited by Claim 1. In addition, paragraph 9 of the Office Action indicates that the claimed transmission unit is disclosed in Chan. However, in Chan, a document encrypted in a host computer is not understood to be transmitted to a printer but is rather understood to be transmitted to a document store 130. In contrast, Claim 1 recites a transmission unit adapted to transmit the encrypted random number, the converted personal identification code and the encrypted print data to a print control apparatus which is connected to the information processing apparatus via a network, as also recited by Claim 1.

Since Claim 1 is understood to recite several features that are not disclosed or suggested by the citations to Chan, Ishiguro, and Parry, Applicant submits that the Office has not yet satisfied its burden of proof to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn. And because independent Claims 9, 11, and 17 recite similar features, they are submitted to be allowable for similar reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 9, 11, and 17 be withdrawn.

The dependent claims are allowable for the reasons given for the independent claims and because they recite features that are patentable in their own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

In view of the above remarks, the application is in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary M. Jacobs

---

Attorney for Applicant  
Gary M. Jacobs  
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
GMJ/BLK/lcw

FCHS\_WS 3800340\_1